DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 171 212 HE 011 292

AUTHOR Kramer, J. Lance

TITLE Some Suggestions for the Management of Human Resources: Procedures at Camelot State College.

INSTITUTION Kansas State Univ., Manhattan. Center for Faculty Evaluation and Development in Higher Education.
SPONS AGENCY Kellogg Foundation, Battle Creek, Mich.
PUB DATE Oct 76
NOTE 22p.
AVAILABLE FROM Center for Faculty Evaluation and Development in Higher Education, 1627 Anderson Ave., Box 3000, Manhattan, KS 66502

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Behavioral Objectives; *College Faculty; Higher Education; Needs Assessment; *Performance Contracts; Resource Guides; *Teacher Behavior; *Teacher Evaluation; *Teacher Role
IDENTIFIERS Faculty College Relationship

ABSTRACT

The development of faculty individual activity/performance agreements, a systematic set of procedures through which the goals or objectives of an institution are expressed as specific behaviors of an individual teacher, are discussed. These types of agreements also have been called growth plans or performance contracts. University objectives and faculty behaviors need to be restated using general activity descriptions and each behavioral statement needs to be examined from the perspective of the principle instructional unit of the institution. The statements also need to be considered at the next level of academic administration to identify any statement that is inappropriate to the unit. Each academic sub-unit needs to rank the objectives with respect to their relative importance. Specification of the exact role and function areas in which faculty members are expected to become involved is necessary. An example of a college is presented to illustrate the principles involved. Steps in forming agreements and elements that should be included in the final agreement are outlined. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED171212

SOME SUGGESTIONS FOR THE MANAGEMENT OF HUMAN RESOURCES: PROCEDURES AT CAMELOT STATE COLLEGE

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Center for Faculty Evaluation & Development in H.E.
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

J. Lance Kramer

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

October, 1976

HE 011 292

Center for Faculty Evaluation and Development
in Higher Education

Kansas State University
1627 Anderson
Manhattan, Kansas 66502

c Center for Faculty Evaluation and Development in Higher Education, 1976

Copyright © Center for Faculty Evaluation and Development in Higher Education, 1978

The Center is supported in part by a grant from the W. K. Kellogg Foundation of Battle Creek, Michigan.

Permission is hereby granted to reproduce single copies of this Guide for non-profit, instructional use.

Multiple copies may be reproduced by institutions using the Center's IDEA system for non-profit, instructional use within that institution

Other individuals or institutions wishing to reproduce multiple copies for non-profit, instructional use should obtain written permission from the Center.

INTRODUCTION

Staffing the modern college or university is a particularly complex and frequently difficult process. Myriad skills and talents, suggested by diverse job titles and position descriptions, are required to sustain the modern academy. While the process of staffing is itself complex, the process of utilizing staff effectively and efficiently is much more complex and of greater importance to an institution. It is the latter process, particularly the effective use of academic personnel, which this brief paper addresses.

The way in which the topic is approached is one the reader may find overly utopian, imagining procedures which may be obtained only at Camelot. I would ask that you suspend your disbelief to ascertain what is possible rather than concentrating on aspects which, at first, seem improbable in the here and now of your own institutional setting.

Differences between academic and non-academic personnel typically come to mind when one considers the nature and scope of staffing in an institution of higher education. Although pronounced, such differences are usually accommodated through the maintenance of distinctly different personnel policies and practices applicable to each group. While acknowledging such differences, the posture taken throughout this paper is that differences within academic staffs are frequently no less pronounced than those which differentiate academic from non-academic personnel. We are aware of the differences between the student affairs person working in the dormitory and the bursar; we should be no less aware of the differences between two modern language professors with respect to their duties and responsibilities. A corollary to this position is that differences within an academic staff should also be accommondated by institutional personnel policies and practices.

Colleges and universities require academic personnel to possess a wide variety of skills and competencies and typically expect such personnel to operate effectively in a number of rather disparate role and function areas. It has been only recently that the higher education community has begun to formally recognize the value of carefully elaborating the specific roles and functions which academic personnel are expected to play. This recognition has been prompted by a number of factors, not the least of which has been demands by institutional governing bodies for greater efficiency and demonstrated effectiveness in operations. Recognition has also been prompted by the increasing faculty interest in professional development and by their concurrent concern about the process of faculty evaluation.

This paper provides an overview of such procedures and is intended for individuals who are unfamiliar with their use in higher education -- more specifically, the structural elements of such procedures, the purposes for them, and the assumptions upon which they are based are explored.

Procedures of this type are appropriate for most academic personnel for both instructional and non-instructional posts. The scope of this effort is limited, however, to a consideration of their applicability to individuals whose major responsibilities entail instruction.

If properly conceived and implemented, these types of arrangements provide a regularized format for the utilization of the human resources of an institution. More specifically, they provide a systematic set of procedures through which:

1. Institutional objectives can be stated in terms of specific behaviors (performances) expected of individual components or units of the institution.

2. Institutional (or unit) objectives can be expressed in terms of specific behaviors (or performances) expected of individual faculty members.

3. The process of institutional self-study/evaluation can be conducted on a continuous basis.

4. The contributions of individual faculty members to the attainment of the institutional (and unit) objectives might be more accurately assessed.

5. Individual differences among faculty members may be recognized and channeled in such a manner so as to have a maximum impact upon the attainment of institutional (or unit) objectives.

6. The contributions of institutional components or sub-units to the attainment of institutional objectives may be more accurately assessed.

7. Role differentiation among academic personnel might be formally recognized.

8. The strengths of individual faculty members may be acknowledged and utilized in such a manner so as to permit the faculty member to make an optimum contribution to the realization of institutional (or unit) objectives.

9. Role differentiation among academic personnel might be formally recognized.

10. The strengths of individual faculty members may be acknowledged and utilized in such a manner so as to permit the faculty member to make an optimum contribution to the realization of institutional (or unit) objectives.

11. The weaknesses of individual faculty members may be identified and acknowledged in such a manner so as to:

    a. facilitate improvement if appropriate (that is, to prompt improvement if the weakness occurs in a role/function area in which the individual is expected to perform), or

    b. formally indicate that improvement is not necessary (that is, when the weakness occurs in a role/function area in which the individual is not expected to be involved).

"Faculty Growth Plan," "Faculty Performance Contracts," etc., which will be referred to consistently throughout this paper as "individual activity/performance agreements," typically include the following components:

1. An agreement involving an individual faculty member and at least one other superordinate person, usually a department chairperson, dean, program director, etc., who is able to represent the institution in the agreement.

2. A time framework which specifies the effective term of the agreement.

3. A description of the institutional or unit objectives which describes or defines the activities in which the faculty member is expected to be involved during the term of the agreement.

4. A description of the specific activities in which the faculty member is expected to become involved.

5. A statement of the expected level or quality of performance in each activity.

6. A specificiation of the individual's strengths and weaknesses with reference to the activities in which she/he is to engage. The intent being to (a) utilize the individual in areas of strength and (b) identify areas in which improvement is necessary.

7. A development plan (if necessary) specifying procedures to overcome identified weaknesses.

8. An in-process evaluation schedule designed to formally accommodate required changes and modifications in the agreement which may be faced by circumstances occurring during the course of the agreement.

9. A terminal evaluation schedule indicating the time and procedures to be employed in evaluating the effect of the agreement at its conclusion.

   N.B. The terminal evaluation of the agreement ordinarily involves the structuring of a subsequent agreement; that is, the evaluation of one agreement provides data which informs the design of the next agreement.

The process of developing an individual activity/performance agreement system involves three distinct stages. Whether the system is to be employed through an institution or in a single component of the unit, the basic stages required are as follows:*

1. The objectives of the institution which are applicable to the unit in which activity/performance agreements are to be used must be restated in operational terms which indicate the full range of behaviors (i.e., involvements) expected of instructional personnel.

2. The relative importance or priority of each objective applicable to the unit in which the agreements are to be used must be determined.

3. Agreements are effected which accommodate the applicable objectives, the priorities assigned to objectives and the specific strengths, weaknesses, and interests of individual faculty members.

THE PROCESS DEFINED

The phrase "individual activity/performance agreements" is employed throughout this paper to describe what elsewhere has been called "faculty growth plans," "faculty development contracts," etc. An "individual activity/performance agreement" is defined as a systematic set of procedures through which the goals or objectives of an institution (or unit thereof) may be expressed in terms of specific behaviors expected of an individual faculty member. As a consequence, it represents a means through which the human resources of an institution may be more effectively utilized and a means through which individual faculty members may allocate their time and energy.

---

*In small-unit experimental uses, procedures such as stage 1 might be by-passed, although institutional use of such procedures would require each stage.

The phrase "individual activity/performance agreements," while more cumbersome than other labels, seems more appropriate for a number of reasons. The term "agreement" is probably more exact than "plan," "contract," or "design." "Contract" seems overly legalistic while the term "agreement," although suggesting a commitment to the attainment of specific ends or objectives, does not imply legal requirements or conditions. "Agreement" is also more exact than "plan" or "design" inasmuch as neither of the latter terms adequately describes the bilateral aspect of such arrangements. "Agreement" clearly suggests the participation of no fewer than two parties and recognizes that agreements are modifiable in a manner less rigid than "re-negotiation."

The term "individual" is employed to emphasize that such agreements are designed within the context of the relationship between the institution (or unit) and an individual faculty member. The term is also employed to acknowledge that such agreements are applicable to non-instructional faculty personnel as well as instructional personnel.

The term "activity" is used to describe the specific roles and functions in which the faculty member is expected to become involved. "Performance" is used in conjunction with "activity" to indicate that the degree, extent, or quality of the individual's involvement in an activity is also a component of the agreement.

The obvious omission of terms such as growth, development, or improvement in the description may prompt some concern. I might suggest that growth or improvement may be taken into account under the heading of performance, which also accommodates the possibility that a person may operate at maximum or optimum levels. Many institutions, and not only smaller ones with limited staff, place extensive burdens on their most competent and most productive academic personnel. To base agreements between such individuals and the institution solely on a growth or improvement equation may have a negative impact upon individuals who are already making optimal or significant contributions to an institution. While arrangements based upon such concepts may be disruptive to such individuals, agreements grounded on the involvement-performance construction are as valuable to the fully functioning individual as to individuals who need to improve.

For faculty members operating at optimum levels, activity/performance agreements provide a formal systematic means by which the consequences of over-involvement and the resulting effects on quality of performance might be identified and considered. These agreements may be employed to identify the point of diminishing return, the point at which the quality of performance is adversely affected by the amount of involvement. Basically, the point being made here is that the activity/performance agreements may be effectively employed with all instructional and non-instructional academic personnel regardless of the scope of their involvements or the quality of performance. Such agreements should not be structured to assist only those personnel who have clear developmental needs. Just as the re-structuring of the classroom situation to assist weaker students should not be accomplished at the expense of excellent students, attempts to improve or develop weak faculty members should not proceed at the neglect of fully contributing faculty members.

INSTITUTIONAL OBJECTIVES AND ACTIVITY/PERFORMANCE AGREEMENTS

It should be apparent from what has already been said that there is a close symbiotic relationship between institutional objectives and individual activity/performance agreements. Institutional objectives provide the means through which the activities considered to be of value to the institution may be identified.

Institutional objectives can constitute the starting point for the elaboration of individual activity/performance assessments. These objectives, which typically consist of broad conceptual statements of what the institution seeks to accomplish, must be restated in operational terms which clearly indicate the full range of behaviors expected of institutional academic personnel in support of the objectives.

Anyone familiar with institutional statements of objectives or the process of translating them into practical terms may be appalled at the apparent ease with which the previous paragraph suggested the operationalization of objectives in behavioral terms. Those familiar with accrediting agencies and their decennial insistence that curricula be determined by institutional objectives are acquainted with the difficulties of operationalizing objectives. The task is not a simple one. Yet restating objectives to facilitate the management of human resources is not nearly as difficult a task as translating objectives into curricular expressions.

At the institutional level, it is not particularly difficult to describe the types of human activity necessary to accomplish institutional objectives. If an institution seeks "the advancement of human knowledge" (or "the discovery of new knowledge," "the discovery of truth," or other similarly lofty goals), the involvement of academic personnel in research-scholarship activities represents a reasonable restatement of the conceptual objective in operational or behavioral terms. Similarly, if an institution aspires to assisting the "social and cultural development of the community," a statement to the effect that personnel are expected to become involved in community-public service activities is an appropriate behavioral expression of the objective.

Objectives employed by most post-secondary level educational institutions typically involve the following:

1. Objectives which pertain to the education of people.
2. Objectives which pertain to the expansion of human knowledge.
3. Objectives which pertain to the social, cultural, and/or economic advancement of the community or institutional clientele.
4. Objectives which pertain to the need for effective and efficient institutional operations.

5. Objectives which pertain to the personal. social, and cultural advancement of students.

These types of objectives suggest the following behaviors:

1. Instructional activities.

2. Research-scholarship activities.

3. Community-public service activities.

4. Institutional service activities.

5. Student service (non-academic) activities.

Restatement of objectives using these rather general activity descriptions is adequate for the purpose of developing individual activity/performance agreements. The restatement of objectives has the practical effect of legitimizing certain specific behaviors, of identifying those behaviors considered to be of value to that institution. Behaviors not specified in the behavioral restatement represent behaviors which the instition may value but in which personnel are not expected to engage. For example, the research-scholarship function may not be suggested by the objectives of a community junior college. While the institution may value staff involvement in research scholarship, the omission of any reference to the activity in the behavioral restatement of objectives means that faculty members are not, by virtue of their appointment, expected or required to be involved in research.

In order to insure that the behavioral restatements have direct implications for instructional personnel, the second step involved in the elaboration of activity-performance agreements entails an examination of each behavioral statement from the perspective of the principal instructional unit of the institution. In situations in which individual activity/performance agreements are to be used for non-instructional and non-academic personnel as well as instructional personnel, each of the principal sub-units of the institution (for example, the Divisions of Academic Affairs, Student Affairs, Financial Affairs, and Public Information and Development) must examine the behavioral restatements from the perspective of the particular role each plays in support of institutional objectives.

Because an examination of the behavioral statements from the perspective of the major instructional unit on campus is not likely to identify any statement as being inappropriate to the unit (except possibly in the case of very small or limited purpose baccalaureate-level institutions and community or junior colleges), the statements must also be considered at the next level of academic administration. In large or comprehensive institutions, the main instructional sub-unit on campus usually consists of a number of separate schools, colleges, or divisions, each responsible for a specific portion of the curriculum. In smaller or special purpose institutions, the instructional sub-unit typically consists of units described as departments, divisions, programs, etc.

It is at this level, the third step in the elaboration of activity/performance agreements, that differences in the relationships between individual sub-units and objectives are first discernible. It is possible, for example, that a College of Liberal Arts in a large institution or a Division of Humanities in a smaller one, would not have specific responsibilities relating to the community-public service objectives of the institution. Within the same institution other sub-units, a College of Nursing or Department of Social Work, might have very specific responsibilities as a consequence of institutional community-public service objectives. Such differences suggest that the role and function areas in which instructional personnel in these sub-units are expected to become involved will also vary according to the specific objectives of the sub-unit.

Some differentiation occurs at this level as a consequence of the unique mission or purpose of each sub-unit. As has been suggested, it is not unusual to find academic-instructional sub-units which are not structured or intended to prompt the realization of every institutional objective.

The most significant differentiaion at this level involves the fourth step in the elaboration of involvement performance agreements. This step involves each academic sub-unit determining the priority of the various objectives it is expected to accomplish, that is, ranking the objectives with respect to their relative importance. There is some reason to suggest that this is the more important step in evolving involvement-performance agreements simply because the priorities assigned to objectives, and thus to specific behavioral expectations, provide an explicit guide or standard which may be employed to allocating the human resources of a sub-unit.*

Assigning priorities to the various objectives (and their behavorial restatements) at this level provides formal acknowledgment that variations in the role and functions of faculty members in the various sub-units are both legitimate and necessary. The assignment becomes the means through which the administrator of the sub-unit can begin to order the human resources of the unit in accordance with the priorities. The assignment also becomes a means of reducing the tension that typically exists within an instructional faculty when individuals recognize that the types of

---

* The process of assigning priorities to the various objectives is complex process which entails an appreciable amount of collaboration among the administrative officers of instructional sub-units (deans, directors, chairpersons, etc.) and between those officers and the chief academic officer of the institution. One of the primary functions of the latter is the effective management of the various academic sub-units. Obviously, the effectiveness of management is enhanced by a clear and common understanding of the specific role each sub-unit plays in the attainment of each institutional objective. Thus, while activity/performance agreements clearly benefit faculty members, their primary value is a common management tool which may be employed on all levels of academic administration.

demands placed upon instructors in other units are frequently different from the demands placed upon them. It is also important to note that the priorities established for individual instructors need not reflect the exact priorities of the sub-unit. There can be differentiation so long as group objectives are supported.

Before continuing with the various stages necessary to develop individual activity/performance agreements, it may be useful to consider more fully the need for specifying the exact role and function areas in which faculty members are expected to become involved.

As previously suggested, most institutional objectives employed by post-secondary level institutions may be behaviorally expressed in terms of the following categories:

1. Instruction
2. Research - Scholarship
3. Public - Community Service
4. Institutional Service
5. Service to Students (non-academic)

With the exception of the research-scholarship function, most institutions have full-time professional personnel in each of the non-instructional areas noted above. For example, admissions-recruitment personnel and financial affairs personnel have responsibilities which are generally confined to the realm of institutional service. If they extend beyond this area at all, the extension is usually confined to closely related types of activities, ordinarily in public-community service.

Non-instructional personnel generally have only limited responsibilities in role and function areas beyond their specializations. Involvement in such areas usually entails the exercise of the skills and competencies necessary for their specialization rather than the exercise of skills and competencies not demanded within their specialization.

However, responsibilities for instructional personnel are seldom confined to instruction or even to a combination of instruction and research. Instructional faculty are ordinarily expected to be quite extensively involved in activities other than instruction. They are expected to evidence scholarship, to publish or to provide other documentation of research activity. They are expected to render institutional service through participation in committee work and through involvement in the institutional decision-making problem-solving structure. They are expected to be contributing members of the civic community and to represent the institution to the community through service to social, cultural, and economic groups and organizations. In addition, they are expected to assist students in non-academic realms such as personal counseling or serve as advisors to student organizations and activities. And finally, instructional faculty are expected to be effective managers of the teaching-learning process.

Distributing the time and energy of instructional faculty among these role-function areas has long been a source of concern and confusion on our campuses. In general. the distribution varies appreciably according to institution and/or institutional sub-unit (college, division, department, etc.). and according to the peculiar strengths, weaknesses, and inclinations of individual faculty members. Variations in role-function areas are not only legitimate, they are essential given the diversity which characterizes both institutions and individuals in higher education. Yet, such variations can have dysfunctional effects if their parameters are unspecified or informal.

Until recently, we have had no systematic means with which to clearly specify the responsibilities of instructional faculty in non-instructional realms. Nor, for that matter, have the devices which we have employed to measure instructional effort been particularly exact or sophisticated (credit hour load, contact hour loads, etc.). Measures used to describe instructional load have, however, been more useful than those used to describe non-instructional load (number of committees, number of memberships, etc.). More often than not, the non-instructional responsibilities of faculty members and the relationship between such responsibilities and instruction have been only vaguely expressed or implied.

The consequence has been that many faculty members, and especially those who hold recent appointments, are altogether uncertain as to the parameters of their role-function areas. Typically, such individuals, uncertain as to what the institution expects of them, either personally determine the scope of their involvement in non-instructional areas and thereby run the risk of involvement in an area that is not considered to be of importance to the institution, or make an effort at some involvement in all non-instructional areas thereby risking their effectiveness through involvement in too many areas. Obviously, there is the additional possibility that they do nothing beyond instruction and thus appear to be less than fully functioning faculty members. Any of these situations is potentially disruptive, both from the standpoint of institutional planning or management and from the standpoint of faculty morale.

Individual activity/performance agreements represent a means of reducing the confusion between what an institution expects of an individual and what the individual thinks or feels might be expected. Such agreements define the activities, in which a faculty member is expected to become involved, which are acknowledged to be of value to the institution. Through omission or explicit exclusion, other activities which are of value to the institution but in which the individual faculty member is not expected to become involved, are also identified.

An example may be helpful at this juncture. A small liberal arts college might consider both faculty involvement in research-scholarship and involvement in community service activities to be of significant value to the institution. It may have several faculty members who are particularly effective in community-public service activities, individuals whose contributions to the institution through the vehicle of community

service obviates the need for them to engage extensively in research. Activity/performance agreements provide a means through which their institution might formally (1) acknowledge the importance to the institution of their continued involvement in community-public service activities while (2) clearly indicating that they are not expected to be involved in research or that any involvement in research is to be considered of secondary importance to their involvement in community-public service activities.

The advantage of such an agreement from an institutional standpoint is to guarantee the continued involvement of these individuals in an area in which they can make a maximum or optimum contribution to the institution. It provides a means through which the community-public service thrust of the institution may be more effectively managed. The advantage to the individuals is in the formal institutional recognition that their involvement is such activities is of greater value to the institution than their involvement in research. Obviously, such recognition has direct and significant implications for the process of faculty evaluation. The faculty members in the example are free to pursue their community service involvement without the threat of being evaluated on the basis of their performance in research.

Once priorities among objectives, and thus among their various behavioral expressions, have been determined on the level of the academic sub-units, variations among sub-units can be formally acknowledged and used for planning.

Possibly an extended example might be useful at this point. A small institution may have objectives which might be behaviorally expressed in terms of the five role and function areas previously noted. These objectives and the corresponding role and function areas may also apply to the principal academic sub-unit of the institution, say, an Office of Academic Affairs. This Office might consist of three basic sub-units: a Division of Nursing, a Division of Liberal Arts, and a Division of Teacher Education. While it may be reasonable to assume that instruction would constitute the primary emphasis of each of these units, considerable variation might be expected with reference to the other behavioral role and function areas. The following pattern of priorities might occur.

	Divisions of		
Priorities	Liberal Arts	Teacher Education	Nursing
1st	instruction	instruction	instruction
2nd	research-scholarship	institutional service	community-public service
3rd	service to students	community-public service	service to students
4th	institutional service	research-scholarship	institutional service
5th	community-public service	service to students	research-scholarship

In this situation, the Teacher Education Division might have extensive service responsibilities within the institution, possibly providing technical or special assistance to academic committees, providing audio-visual assistance to the general faculty, conducting a faculty development program, etc. The Nursing Division may have extensive interactions with community health and social service agencies and with local governmental units. And, while these types of responsibilities may be extremely important from the standpoint of these divisions, the Division of Liberal Arts may have not more than a limited or minor role in either area. As a consequence (or perhaps as a cause), the Liberal Arts unit may consider research-scholarship as an activity of high priority.

Typically, in either small or large institutional settings, colleges or divisions are ordinarily made up of departments, or at least department-like structures. Because it is this unit, the basic unit of academic administration, which effects individual involvement-performance agreements with faculty members, the process of identifying applicable objectives and determining the priority of each must be repeated at the departmental level.*

Extending the previous example, a Division of Teacher Education might include the following departments, each relating to the divisional objectives in a slightly different way:

	Departments of			
Priorities	Elementary Education	Secondary Education	Early Childhood Education	Special Education
1st	instruction	instruction	instruction	research-scholarship
2nd	community-public service	institutional service	institutional service	instruction
3rd	institutional service	community-public service	community-public service	institutional service
4th	research-scholarship	service to student	research-scholarship	community public service
5th	service to student	research-scholarship	service to student	service to student

*In effect, the most appropriate level on which to formally effect an agreement is the administrative unit closest to the faculty member which has the capability of committing the institution to the agreement. Ideally, the agreement should involve the faculty member and the individual who is most immediately responsible for the unit in which the faculty member serves and who is responsible for the evaluation of the individual's performance and the actual work assignment of the individual. While this person is likely to be a departmental chairperson, institutional circumstances might dictate the direct participation of a dean or other administrator.

Obviously, the example represents a highly abstract construction which may bear little resemblance to the realities of college and university organization. It does not account for variations in departmental size, intensity of effort, or budgeting commitments to priorities. It is used to demonstrate only that the priorities assigned by departments within a college/division may differ appreciably from those assigned by the college/division itself, without being disruptive to the college/division goals.

The assignment of priorities at this academic-administrative level:

1. Provides a structure which the administrators may employ to guide the allocation of human resources within the sub-unit.

2. Provides a means through which the chief academic officer of the institution may determine whether the human resources of various sub-units are appropriately assigned and utilized.

3. Provides a means through which variations which occur in the roles and functions of faculty members in the various are formally stated and legitimized.

4. Provides the framework for the preparation of individual involvement-performance agreements with faculty members.

Once priorities among objectives have been established on the academic-administrative level which is directly responsible for the involvement and performance of a faculty member, the individual activity/performance agreement can be prepared by the administrator of the unit and the individual instructor.

Before detailing the procedures employed in the actual framing of such an agreement, it might be useful to note that not all faculty members within a single department (or similar unit) will have roles and functions which correspond to the ordering of priorities among such roles and functions at the level of the department (or sub-unit). What is important is that, collectively, the functional responsibilities of all faculty members reflect departmental priorities.

To continue the example already employed, we have seen that the priorities assigned to various objectives/activities by the several departments within the Division of Teacher Education vary considerably from the priorities assigned by the Division itself. Collectively, however, the departmental priorities correspond to those of the Division. Thus, it is possible for the major research-scholarship effort within the Division to be handled primarily by one department. Concurrently, it is possible for the Special Education Department to specify research-scholarship as its first priority activity/objective without disrupting the general priority orientation of the Division, an orientation that does not place emphasis upon research scholarship.

The same types of circumstances pertain within a department. Each professor within the department of Special Education need not have research-scholarship as his/her main activity. Each professor can relate

to departmental objectives differently so long as the collective relationship corresponds to the departmental priorities.

The Department of Secondary Education might, for example, find the following priorities among staff to be appropriate with respect to its objectives:

Faculty of Secondary Education Department

Priorities Objectives/Activities

Professor	Instruc.	Inst. Ser	Com-Pub Ser	Ser to Student	Res-Scholar
A	1	4	3	5	2
B	1	3	5	2	4
C	1	2	3	4	5
D	3	4	1	2	5
E	2	3	1	4	5
F	1	4	3	5	2
G	2	5	4	1	3
H	1	2	5	3	4
I	3	4	1	5	2
J	4	3	1	2	5

Again, such an example is highly abstract and does not account for variables which may substantially influence and affect the relationship between individual performance and departmental objectives. For example, Professor J has research-scholarship as his/her lowest priority activity but may actually be more productive in this realm than Professor A who has it as a high priority activity. The example is used simply to demonstrate that variations in faculty activities and priorities may occur without disrupting the overall ability of the unit to seek its objectives. In the example, the collective priorities of the departmental faculty correspond to departmental priorities.

One of the basic tasks of academic administration is the effective and efficient utilization of both human and material resources. The alignment of departmental human resources is a responsibility of the department chairperson. As a consequence, the department chairperson (or other administrator in a similar situation) is in a pivotal position with respect to shaping involvement-performance agreements. In the process of formulating such agreements, the chairperson represents the interests of the institution and is obligated (perhaps by his or her own activity/performance agreement with a dean or division administrator) to insure that the alignment of human resources within the unit corresponds to the objectives the unit seeks to attain. To do this, the chairperson, in addition to having a sound grasp of both the objectives and their behavioral implications, must be thoroughly conversant with (1) the specific strengths of individual faculty members within the department in each of the behavioral realms suggested by the objectives, (2) the specific weaknesses of individual faculty members within the department in each of

the behavioral realms suggested by the objectives, and (3) the specific interests or inclination of individual faculty members within the department with respect to their involvement in each of the behavioral realms suggested by the objectives.

A thorough understanding of individual strengths, weaknesses, and interests within a department (or similar unit) is a necessary pre-condition of effective management. Aligning these variables so that a maximum or optimum contribution toward the realization of departmental objectives may be made is the principal responsibility of the administrator. Activity/performance agreements serve a dual purpose with respect to these variables. During the initial period of their use, either within an entire department or for a single faculty member, they provide a means through which the occurrence and distribution of these variables may be identified and formally acknowledged. Subsequently, they form the structure through which the variables may be monitored or channeled.

As has previously been emphasized, determining priorities among departmental objectives* is a pre-condition for elaborating individual agreements. While the determination of such priorities might involve many individuals on the departmental level (faculty, dean, chairperson, academic vice-president), the management of established priorities is ordinarily the task of the departmental chairperson or head.

The initial step in forming agreements is the formal publication of departmental objectives and priorities by the chairperson. While it might be useful to incorporate the statement of departmental objectives and priorities in individual agreements as the first section, the actual manner of publication is less important than the fact of publication. Publication for members of the department, perhaps in departmental memorandum or letter form, enables faculty members to begin to develop their own priorities. Publication also makes clear the priorities which must be observed by the chairperson.

Once department priorities have been established and published, the individual faculty members prepare an agreement proposal. The proposal constitutes an individual response to the department objectives and their behavioral aspects. Numerous formats for these proposals are possible although the format should be close to that which will be used for the final agreement. If the format for both is the same, the following elements would be included:

1. Administrative Details. The name of the department, the faculty member, and the department chairperson.

---

*N.B. The priorities among objectives imply priorities among various types of activities. Thus, the behavioral restatements of objectives are considered to be components of the objective.

2. Term of the Agreement. A provision which specifies the period of time during which the agreement is to be effective. There are a number of reasons which suggest that the term of the agreement should not be particularly long, perhaps no more than one or two academic years. Such agreements are planning instruments which involve regular in-process and terminal evaluation components which inform subsequent plans. As a consequence, there is no need for them to cover protracted time periods. Moreover, the agreement is dependent upon information which requires knowledge of scheduling in other realms such as future instructional schedules, counseling loads, and committee assignments. While an effective term of one or two years is probably preferable, such agreements should also be structured with reference to the frequencies with which department objectives are reviewed and in consideration of the time provisions contained in individual faculty contracts. Because agreements are tailored for individuals, agreements of various lengths may be employed within a single department.

3. Statement of Department Objectives/Behaviors/Priorities or a Specific Reference to the Applicable Statement. The agreement should include the department objectives, etc., or should contain a specific reference to the publication employed by the chairperson to notify the department faculty of the objectives. The intent here is to tie the agreement to exact objectives so the possibility of misunderstanding of what is expected is reduced. The objectives, as well as their behavioral restatements, should be included (either in the agreement or in the publication noted in the agreement) and the priority of each objective should be clearly indicated. (N.B. Department Priorities)

4. In-Process Evaluation Schedule. In-process evaluation refers to the evaluation of the agreement during the period in which it is in effect. It has two components. The first answers the question, "Is the agreement itself sound or appropriate?" The second answers the question, "Is the agreement being fulfilled?" The first provides an opportunity for the agreement to be changed, modified, or adjusted during the effective term. Numerous forces and factors impact upon individuals, departments, and institutions. In-process evaluation provides an opportunity to accommodate or account for change during the course of the agreement. The second question provides for an in-course review of the activity/performance realm of the agreement.

   The In-Process Review Schedule should specify the date of time of the review(s), the names and roles of those to be involved, and the purpose of the review(s). This section may also be used to specify any components of the agreement that cannot be changed during the agreement.

5. Previous Evaluation. This section would appear only in circumstances where previous agreements have been in effect. It contains the principal conclusions drawn from the terminal evaluation of the previous agreement and a specification of recognized strengths and weaknesses of the individual. The assumption here is that the activities section of the agreement will reflect strengths and will contain provisions for improvement in areas of weaknesses related to high-priority individual objectives.

6. Specification of Individual Activity. This section should specify the activities in which the faculty member will become involved during the term of the agreement. The format of the section should follow the structure of the department's statement of objectives and their behavioral restatements. Each behavior should be included in the agreement whether or not the faculty member will actually be involved in activities relating to the behavior. In such instances, the agreement should specify that the faculty member will not or is not expected to be involved in the area. Using the role and function areas previously noted in this document as an example, the activities section could include:

   a. Instructional--including the specific courses the faculty member will be responsible for during the agreement.

   b. Research-Scholarship--a specification of research projects underway and to be completed during the term as well as a specification of the individual's involvement in scholarly and professional organizations.

   c. Community-Service--a description of the individual's proposed involvement in community, civic, social, etc., groups, associations, and organizations.

   d. Service to Students--a description of proposed involvement with student activities and organizations and with the Student Affairs unit of the institution.

   e. Service to the Institution--a description of the proposed involvement in departmental and institutional committees, councils, study groups, etc., and a elaboration of proposed involvement in administrative operations (registration, recruitment, etc.).

   f. Special Activities--specification of activities designed to address recognized weaknesses in all relevant role and function areas.

7. Specification of Priorities. This section assigns priorities among the activities noted in the previous section.

8. Specification of Performance. For each of the activities, a level of performance is to be specified. Such a level might be most easily stated in terms of the evidence that will be accepted as being indicative of satisfactory performance. In other words, the means to be used to evaluate performance in each area are to be specified. The assumption here is that these means involve the use of standards or criteria which may be used to specify levels of performance.

9. Provisions for Terminal Evaluation. This section should detail the procedures to be employed and the individuals to be involved in the evaluation of the agreement after its conclusion. It may also specify the consequences which may result from failing to meet or exceeding the expected performance levels.

10. Administrative Details. Signatures of the individual and chairperson indicating acceptance of the agreement.

The proposed agreement is submitted to the department chairperson by the faculty member and becomes the basis for a discussion between the two centering upon the specific provisions of the agreement. Because it is essential that the chairperson balance the specific needs of the department with the strengths, weaknesses, and inclinations of all members of the department, it is necessary for the chairperson to receive and carefully review the proposals for each faculty member before negotiating individual agreements.

Conclusion

The procedure and suggestions made above are based upon a somewhat idealized view of higher education and the complexities of administrative-faculty relationships. As a consequnce, much experimentation and testing needs to be done by an institution before the model suggested above can even be approached. Unlike some faculty utilization and development schemes which simply may be adopted "from above," the intricacies of the procedures suggested here are such that initial use of the approach should probably be confined to a limited number of faculty members in a single department or sub-unit. Experimentation for several semesters with a limited number of individuals is probably necessary to adjust such procedures to the unique and special characteristics of any institution or sub-unit.

One of the appeals of this type of an approach is that it may be used for academic administrators as well as faculty members. Experimental efforts involving instructional faculty in the elaboration and use of individual activity/performance agreements should probably also extend to the academic administrator who is involved in the development of such agreements. The involvement of the administrator in the design and conduct of an agreement with her or his immediate supervisor is likely to have a beneficial effect upon faculty acceptance and support of the approach.

As institutions of higher education continue to be buffeted by myriad societal factors over which they have little control, demands for greater operating efficiency and effectiveness will continue to be made. While individual activity/performance agreements do not represent a final or complete response to such demandse, they represent an approach to the management of human resources that deserves the careful consideration of college and university faculty and administrative officers.